

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Priority

The Office requested that the priority claim to a non-provisional application included an identification of a non-provisional application and the relationship of that application to the present application. The *applicant agrees and amended the priority paragraph* accordingly.

Specification Objection

The Office requested that the term "comprises" in the abstract be replaced by the term "includes". The *applicant revised the abstract accordingly*. The Office further request that the Graph in the specification is entered as a Figure. The *applicant revised the specification accordingly and added Figure 1*. The Office still further request that the title be changed to for descriptiveness. The *applicant revised the title as suggested by the Office*.

35 USC § 112

Claims 9-16 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for use of the term "drawn". Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the term "drawn" would lack proper antecedent basis. The applicant disagrees. Nevertheless, to advance the present claims to issuance, the *applicant amended claim 9 as suggested by the Examiner*.

In view of the present amendments and arguments, the applicant believes that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

RUTAN & TUCKER



Martin Fessenmaier, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 46,697

611 Anton Blvd., 14th Floor

Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Tel.: (714) 641-5100